IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 12207 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

PREETHA NARASIMHAN

Versus

DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL EDU.

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 12207 of 2002

MR KV SHELAT for Petitioner No. 1

MS NANDINI JOSHI, AGP for Respondent No. 1

MR MITUL K SHELAT for Respondent No. 2

DS AFF.NOT FILED (R) for Respondent No. 3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

Date of decision: 17/12/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

When the matter is called out for hearing, Mr.K.V.Shelat, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has already been granted the provisional eligibility certificate dated November 19,

2003 pursuant to the declaration given by the Equivalence Committee regarding equivalence of B.I.T. Course of Manipal Academy of Higher Education with B.Sc. Course of the Gujarat University.

2. Mr.Mitul Shelat, learned counsel for the Gujarat University does not dispute the above statement and states that, upon withdrawal of the petition, the Gujarat University will issue the final eligibility certificate in favour of the petitioner.

3. In view of the above statements and the provisional eligibility certificate dated November 19, 2003, which is taken on record, it appears that the petitioner's grievance is redressed, and, therefore, this Court is not required to adjudicate any issue, as the University has accepted the petitioner's contention about equivalence of two degrees, which exercise was undertaken pursuant to the interim order dated December 24, 2002 passed by this Court. It goes without saying that the respondents will now declare the petitioner's result of M.B.A. Part-I Examination held by the University.

3. In view of the above developments, the petition is disposed of after recording the aforesaid statement and subject to the aforesaid direction regarding declaration of the petitioner's result of M.B.A. Part-I Examination. Subject to the above direction, rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

Direct service is permitted.

(M.S.Shah,J)